

## REMARKS

The Examiner has issued a new ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), stating that claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable over Alexander in view of Ward et al (“Ward”). Applicants submit that Ward is the closest prior art to the invention as recited in claims 1 and 2. Ward shows a displayed waveform 102 representing a long data record (details of the displayed waveform are not readily apparent) with a zoom region indicator 106. Also Ward simultaneously displays a zoomed waveform 108 which is the portion of the displayed waveform defined by the zoom region. The zoom region indicator of Ward has a width and an associated marker 104 corresponding to a marker 110 on the zoomed waveform. However the marker of Ward does not span “the width of the zoom region and [have] at least a minimum length” as is recited by Applicants despite the Examiner’s assertion to the contrary (“[W]hen the zoom region indicator has only a few pixel width, the marker 104 or 304 spans the width of the zoom region and has a length equal to or greater than the width of the zoom region, the length being greater than the width of the zoom region when the width is less than a specified dimension” (Emphasis in original)). The marker of Ward for the zoom indicator is an arrow head that does not change in size, the base being always the same width. Therefore the marker does ***NOT*** span “the width of the zoom region and [have] at least a minimum length” as recited by Applicants, but has a constant width regardless of the size of the zoom indicator.

Further Ward does not manipulate the “associated marker” (the marker 104), but rather manipulates the marker 110 on the zoomed waveform which causes the zoom indicator 106 together with the associated marker to move on the displayed

waveform. Thus Ward suffers from the same problem as discussed by Applicants in the specification, i.e., the problem of moving the zoom region quickly from one point in the displayed waveform to another. Ward also doesn't indicate, as recited by Applicants in claim 2, that the associated marker and zoomed waveform are of a color different from that of the displayed waveform so that, in the presence of multiple zoom regions on the displayed waveform, it is readily apparent which zoom region is associated with the zoomed waveform.

Additionally it is noted that the present invention is assigned to the same assignee as Ward, as indicated by the attached copy of the Assignment Declaration.

The Examiner continues to maintain the same argument with regard to Alexander, which Applicants have refuted previously. Alexander does not display a long data record (a "single pulse waveform" is NOT a long data record); does not have an independent marker associated with the zoom box; has the bottom of the zoom box always equal to the width of the zoom box and therefore does not have "at least a minimum width"; and the zoom box is not moved by moving the bottom of the zoom box but only by redrawing the zoom box. Alexander does not at all address the problem of moving the zoom indicator rapidly from one portion of the displayed waveform (long data record) to another which is a part of the problem addressed by Applicants.

Alexander does show the rescaling rectangle in a color different from the waveform, but does not indicate that the rescaled waveform is in the same color as the rescaling rectangle, as is recited by Applicants in claim 2.

Therefore neither reference teaches or suggests that an independent marker associated with the zoom indicator is what is moved to move the zoom indicator

from one position in the displayed waveform (long data record) to another; that the marker has a width equal to or greater than the width of the zoom indicator; or that the marker and zoomed waveform are of the same color different from the color of the displayed waveform. Thus claims 1 and 2 are deemed to be allowable as being nonobvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over Alexander in view of Ward.

In view of the foregoing comments allowance of claims 1 and 2 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
ROBERT L. BEASLEY, ET AL.

By   
Thomas F. Lenihan, Reg. No. 32,152  
Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC.  
Thomas F. Lenihan  
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)  
Beaverton, OR 97077  
(503) 627-7266

Attorney's Docket No.: 7452-US1

November 28, 2006